

REMARKS

The claims are revised to define over the applied art. Claims 1-40 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Claims 1-11, 15-23, and 27-40 were rejected as anticipated by *Bates* (US 6,944,821). The Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection as possibly applied to the amended claims.

Amended Claim 1 defines a method for providing data reference information relating to data copied from a first computer application to a memory. The data copying may occur, for example, when a user is collecting data for research or some other purpose using a computer, and desires to paste that data to another location such as a destination application for later review (specification page 12, lines 2-5). The copied data reference information, which relates to the copied data, may be associated with the data in a background location (e.g., memory or hidden fields) or generated by the source application when the data itself is copied (specification page 13, lines 2-5). The rejection over *Bates* asserts, in effect, that *Bates* teaches those elements of the present invention.

However, Claim 1 now also requires pasting to the second computer application additional reference information relating to the data. That *additional reference information* is obtained from a source other than the first computer application, in response to pasting the data copied from the first computer application. The additional reference information, as well as the reference information copied from the first computer application and pasted to the second computer application, can be reviewed along with the pasted data itself. *Bates* fails to disclose these further elements now required by the method defined by Claim 1.

Those features added to the combination of Claim 1 are discussed in the specification, for example, at page 16, lines 13-21. The additional reference information may come from other applications, such as the destination application itself (e.g., time/date of copying and

pastings the data to the destination application, the user ID of the person copying and pasting the data, but not obtained from the first computer application).

Figs. 5 and 6 show exemplary views resulting from pasting the data itself, the reference information relating to the data, and the *additional reference information* relating to the data. For example, the pasted data 502 appears in Fig. 5 along with pasted data reference information 504. The reference information includes the IP address (i.e., "reference information") relating to the copied-pasted data, and also includes "additional reference information", namely the "Pasted-on" label and the "Pasted-by" label. That additional reference information relates to the data, indicating the date the data was pasted and the identity of the person who pasted the data. However, that additional reference information would not have come from the data source itself, unlike the IP address shown at 504 in Fig. 5.

Fig. 6 shows additional examples including pasted data 602, 603 and respective pasted data reference information 604, 605. The data reference information includes reference information copied from the first computer application (IP addresses for 604 and 605, document title and author for 605) and additional reference information labeled: Collected by and Date/Time, in 604 and 605; Page location and Last-edited date, in 604; and in 605 the Source, namely, the location on the computer C drive where the pasted information resides.

Nothing in *Bates* anticipates or teaches pasting additional reference information relating to the data. Fig. 10 of *Bates* shows "Source Information obtained from the data source itself." Column 9, lines 53-58 state that "all of this information is embedded in tags... for the web page, and can be determined by parsing the HTML code and storing the relevant values in the source information field 350 of the annotated paste buffer 330." It is thus apparent that *Bates* discloses nothing more than copying and pasting data from a source, and

source information obtained from that source. Accordingly, *Bates* fails to anticipate Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom.

Dependent Claim 2 adds appending one or more descriptive labels to the additional reference information in response to pasting that additional reference information to the second computer application. Examples of those descriptive labels appended to the additional reference information are shown at 605 in Fig. 6, e.g., "Collected by:" and "Source:". *Bates* discloses only storing source information from the document from which data was copied (column 9, lines 44-48) but does not anticipate descriptive labels appended to additional reference information. Claim 2 is novel over *Bates* for this further reason.

Dependent Claim 3 recites one or more descriptive labels appended to the additional reference information. Those enumerated descriptive labels identify additional reference information obtained from a source other than the first computer application, contrary to the disclosure in *Bates*. The method including the elements of Claim 3 is thus novel over *Bates*.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 and adds that the additional reference information is generated. An example of generated additional reference information is the hard-disk file where the source data was saved, as shown in 605 of Fig. 6. The combination including the additional feature added by Claim 4 is novel over *Bates*, in which col. 5, lines 14-16 mention only paste preferences to determine whether or not to create a citation when pasting copied information.

Dependent Claim 5 adds that the additional source information is copied from the source other than the first computer application (from which the data itself is copied). Claim 5 further defines certain kinds of additional reference information, and now excludes information that may come from the first computer application. Nothing in *Bates* anticipates a method including the limitations added by Claim 5. The passages at col. 4, line 60 and col.

S/N 10/664,740

9, lines 50-51 of that reference describe only the URL and other information from the copied Web page, and so that claim is novel over *Bates*.

Claims 6-11 each depend from Claim 1 and are novel over *Bates* for the reasons discussed above with regard to that parent claim.

Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 and calls for obtaining the additional reference information from the second computer application. Claim 16, depending from Claim 15, further defines the additional reference information as comprising at least one of the identity of the user pasting the data, the date or time the data was copied, and the date or time the data was pasted. *Bates* limits the copied information to the extent of availability from the source document (col. 9, lines 46-48) and thus fails to disclose obtaining any information from a "second computer application, namely, the destination of data copied from a first computer. For these further reasons, Claims 15 and 16 are novel over *Bates*.

Independent Claim 18 defines a computer system for providing data reference information. Claim 18 as currently amended, comprises a processing unit, responsive to instructions, for copying data and reference information from a first document to the memory of the computer system, pasting that data and reference information to a second document, obtaining additional reference information from a source other than the first document and relating to the data, and pasting to the second document that additional reference information relating to the data. The reference information and the additional reference information related to the data can be reviewed along with that data. As pointed out above with regard to Claim 1, *Bates* fails to disclose obtaining and pasting that additional reference information from another source, so that the reference information and the additional reference information relating to the data can be reviewed along with the data. Accordingly, the computer system including the limitations of Claim 18 is novel over *Bates*.

Claims 19-23 depend from Claim 18 and are novel over *Bates* for the foregoing reasons. Furthermore, Claim 19 requires that the processing unit operate for appending at least one descriptive label to the additional reference information when the additional reference information is pasted to the second document. *Bates* fails to disclose either pasting additional reference information or pending a descriptive label to such additional reference information. Claim 19, accordingly, is novel over *Bates*.

Claim 20 depends from Claim 19 and adds kinds of descriptive labels that the processing unit operates to append to the additional reference information. Those descriptive labels now omit the source of the data, the author of the data, and the title of the document from which the data was copied, those omitted items being "reference information" not -- additional reference information-- as required by the computer system of Claim 20. That claim is thus novel over *Bates*.

Claim 21, depending from Claim 18, requires that the processing unit operate for generating the additional reference information relating to the data. Nothing in *Bates* discloses that the "copied information" be generated by the processing unit doing the copying and pasting of the data. To the contrary, that information in *Bates* relates to the source of the copied information (column 1, line 67-column 2, line 2). Claim 21 is novel over *Bates* for those additional reasons.

Dependent Claim 22 further defines the processing unit as operating to obtain the additional reference information by copying from the source other than the first document. *Bates* does not disclose any such operation, and so Claim 22 is novel for that further reason.

Dependent Claim 27 adds that the processing unit operates for obtaining the additional reference information from the second document and pasting that additional reference information to the second document. This operation, as previously discussed, is not

disclosed or discussed by *Bates* and so Claim 27, along with Claim 28 depending from Claim 27, is novel over *Bates*.

Independent Claim 29 and the dependent Claims 30-40 define a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for providing data reference information. That logic includes logic for obtaining additional reference information from a source other than the source of the data, and pasting that to the computer application additional reference information to the computer application. The operational steps identified in Claim 29 are novel over *Bates* as pointed out above, e.g., with regard to Claim 1, and so a computer-readable medium having instructions as defined by Claim 29 and comprising providing that information is likewise novel over *Bates*.

Claims 30-40 depend from Claim 29 and add limitations analogous to limitations of the method claims and the computer system claims previously discussed. Claims 30-40 are thus novel over *Bates* for the reasons discussed with regard to parent claim 29 as well as the arguments set forth above with respect to previous dependent claims.

Claims 12-14 and 24-26 were rejected as unpatentable over *Bates*. The Applicants traverse that rejection as possibly applied to the amended claims. Moreover, dependent Claim 24 requires that the processing unit operate to copy the additional reference information from a third document to the memory, and to paste that additional reference information from the memory to the second document (where the copied data is pasted). Again, *Bates* fails to disclose the particular operation required by a processing unit according to Claim 24, and that claim is novel over the reference.

The rejection acknowledges that *Bates* does not teach copying additional reference information related to the data from a third computer application to the memory, but asserts that column 4, lines 4-50 of that reference would have made that missing teaching obvious to

S/N 10/664,740

one of ordinary skill. However, a close reading of that cited passage from *Bates* reveals a discussion of the *copied information* 340, namely, the source information. *Bates* points out that the copied information 340 may include or exclude formatting or other information that relates to the information cut or copied into annotated past buffer 330 (column 4, lines 24-27). However, that copied information 340 does not include any information relating to identifying characteristics of the source document from which the information was cut or copied (column 4, lines 27-30). It thus becomes clear that *Bates* contemplated copying/pasting information 340 in ways to include or exclude formatting or other information relating to the copied/pasted information. However, nothing in that cited passage from *Bates*, or elsewhere in that reference, discloses or suggests copying additional reference information related to the data from a third computer application. Those teachings come only from the present Applicants, and are not disclosed or suggested by *Bates*. Accordingly, Claims 12-14 and 24-26 are patentable over that reference.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The Applicants respectfully submit that all claims in this application are novel and patentable over the applied art, and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: August 3, 2006

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

